



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,090	03/26/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010053US1	7726

7590 11/17/2004

Joseph R. Burwell
Law Office of Joseph R. Burwell
P.O. Box 28022
Austin, TX 78755-8022

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,090

Applicant(s)

DUTTA, RABINDRANATH

Examiner

James H Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/26/01.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 14, 16-22, 29, 31-37, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FinePrint (documentation from old web site, 02/29/2000, downloaded from <http://web.archive.org/web/20000301042424/www.singletrack.com/>*) in view of FinePrint Web (review submitted 08/18/2000, downloaded from <http://www.5star-shareware.com/Utilities/Printing-Utilities/finprint-web98.html>, 11/08/04).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 16, and 31), FinePrint teaches that it is a Windows printer driver that captures printer output and provides additional formatting control and data transfer options. It is exceptionally easy to use (see tutorial) and has received rave reviews from a worldwide audience of both corporate and home users. FinePrint works with all printers and greatly enhances their capability. FinePrint saves printing time since pages can be printed 2, 4 or 8 on a single sheet. The universal print preview with zoom and page delete capability ensures that you print only what you want and not what your application gives you. With bitmap skipping and page deletion, using FinePrint saves on expensive ink, paper, filing space, disposal costs, printer wear and tear (home page, 1st three paragraphs; compare with Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 16, and 31), “... ***configuring a print option, wherein the***

Art Unit: 2176

print option comprises one or more user-configurable print parameters that indicate a user preference with respect to reducing consumption of one or more physical resources during printing"). FinePrint does not specifically teach the steps of printing a document. However, FinePrint Web teaches that it is for Windows 95/98 is an excellent printing utility that gives complete control over printing Web and Adobe PDF pages (*structured documents*). With FinePrint Web you can: Preview your print jobs from any browser, Save your web pages in a file, Copy them to the clipboard and paste into other applications, Combine multiple web pages into a single print job and print or save together, Print your web pages at 2, 4, or 8 pages per sheet, Print booklets and double-sided pages on any printer. Using 2, 4, or 8 up layout options can save a significant amount of paper when printing web pages. Not only can you print multiple pages on a sheet, but you can delete unwanted pages such as web pages that contain only a button or a copyright notice. Often, web pages are truncated on the right, resulting in missing characters and incomplete bitmaps. With FinePrint Web, you can preview the pages before they are printed to ensure that they are correct. If they are not, you can use the paper-scaling feature fix the problem. Documents printed 4 or 8 up can be stored in a much smaller space than documents printed in standard 1 up mode. When you print to FinePrint Web, your pages appear in a preview window. You can then add blank pages or remove pages you don't want. The booklet feature can be used to create compact 2 up, double-sided booklets. It's also possible to combine different print jobs together to be printed as a single job (Review p. 1 of 2). FinePrint Web also teaches that to use it, 1. Open your browser; 2. Load your web pages as normal;

3. Select the Print command from the File menu (*receiving a print request to print a hardcopy of a structured document being displayed within a browser window*); 4. Select the "FinePrint Web driver" item from the Print dialog box. Click OK (*detecting a print option*); 5. Wait for the FinePrint Web preview box to appear; 6. Make your printing selections in the dialog and press OK (*generating a modified copy of the structured document in accordance with the user-configurable print parameters, printing a hardcopy of a modified structured document*) (Review p. 2 of 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of FinePrint and FinePrint Web as both are dealing with essentially the same product. FinePrint Web's teaching describes how to use the product with a computer and printer in a step-by-step fashion, providing the benefit of saving printer and other output resources.

In regard to dependent Claims 2-4 (and similarly dependent Claims 17-19, and 31-33), FinePrint teaches that with bitmap skipping and page deletion, using FinePrint *saves on expensive ink, paper, filing space, disposal costs, printer wear and tear*. Also, FinePrint is an *environmentally friendly product since much less paper, ink, ink cartridges, and electricity are used to print a given amount of output* (p. 1 of 1, under "saves trees"; compare with Claim 2 (and similarly Claims 17, and 31), "... **setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to reduce consumption of color toner** (Claims 2, 17, 31), **color ink** (Claims 3, 18, and 32), and **paper** (Claims 4, 19, and 33) **during printing of documents in response to the print request**"). Although FinePrint does not explicitly state *color* toner or ink, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conclude that given a different printer and/or driver that FinePrint would have allowed for savings in ink or toner be it black or some other color. The benefit would have been save in the cost of one component of typical printing supplies.

In regard to dependent Claim 5 (and similarly dependent Claims 20, and 34), FinePrint teaches that paper scaling allows large pages to be scaled so that they fit on standard paper sizes such as letter or A4 (thus reducing the amount of paper used by fitting more on the page (8th bullet, under heading labeled Feature list; compare with Claim 5 (and similarly Claims 20, and 34), “... **setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference as to an amount of reduction of consumption of a physical resource during printing of documents in response to the print request**”). Though FinePrint does not explicitly state an amount of reduction, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conclude that letter sized paper was a different size than A4, thus even if for example, a percentage scale was not available, the mere choice of a paper size would have been a user-selectable choice of scaling, providing the benefit of reducing the amount of paper that might have been used.

In regard to dependent Claim 6 (and similarly dependent Claims 21, and 35), FinePrint teaches that watermark, header and footer option allows documents to be marked with the date, time, security status, user name, printer name and other system variables (3rd bullet under heading Feature list; compare with Claim 6 (and similarly Claims 21, and 35), “... **setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a**

user preference to include, on the hardcopy, the modified copy of the structured document, a printed indication of a content modification to the structured document response to the print request”). Though FinePrint does not explicitly teach an indication of a content modification, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that given the numerous options for headers, footers, and watermarks explicitly taught by FinePrint, that one of more of those taught indications could have contained an indication of content modification, such as the date and time (a later time might indicate a change in the document from that printed at an earlier time). The benefit would have been to allow one to determine one set of printed pages from the other.

In regard to dependent Claim 14 (and similarly dependent Claims 29, and 43), FinePrint teaches adjustable margins allowing for increased text sizes for better readability while using more of the available area on the page (Section marked Feature list, 9th bullet; compare with Claim 14 (and similarly Claims 29, and 43), “... ***the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: transcoding an element to change a value associated with an attribute selected from the group consisting color, font size, or margin size***”).

Claims 7-12, 15, 22-27, 30, 36-41, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FinePrint in view of FinePrint Web and in further view of Hoffman Jr. et al. (hereinafter Hoffman, U.S. Patent No. 6,122,657).

In regard to dependent Claim 7 (and similarly dependent Claims 22, and 36), neither FinePrint nor FinePrint Web teach *filtering the structured document to remove an element associated with a first Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) that is not located within a domain identified by a second URI by which the structured document was retrieved prior to being displayed within the browser window*. However, Hoffman teaches a dynamic web filter that modifies incoming structured (web) documents according to a user configuration (Col. 3, lines 25-38). Hoffman also teaches that the filter can disable tags such as tags that might link to images directed toward advertising (link contains for example a /ad/ subdirectory (Col. 8, lines 45-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of FinePrint, FinePrint Web and Hoffman because all three inventions ultimately save resources. Hoffman adds filtering out components of web documents that are not desirable to the user. The benefit would have been to save resources by condensing what is viewed to the least number of pages possible, whether the output goes to a screen or to a printer.

In regard to dependent Claim 8 (and similarly dependent Claims 23, and 37), neither FinePrint nor FinePrint Web teach *determining that the first URI is within a configurable list of URIs prior to removing the element associated with the first URI*. However, Hoffman teaches that to kill or filter the image, the method allocates a

Art Unit: 2176

memory buffer at line (458), for storing an image URL data structure. At line (475), the full tag is copied into the image URL structure. Then, at line (477), the method parses the image URL, and then parses the base URL at line (478). This setup allows the system to establish a network connection with the site, if needed. At lines 483-484, the method creates a fully qualified image URL (*structure*), converting from relative addressing if needed. How the image is to be killed is determined at line (491), by referencing a per session cache storing results on how to process images. If the image is on the user's personal kill list (*configurable list*) (tested at line 492), the method proceeds to kill the image. The specific call for killing the image occurs at line (501) (Col. 30, lines 9-22). Though Hoffman does not explicitly teach removing an element associated with the first URI (URN, URL, address), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of FinePrint, FinePrint Web, and Hoffman understand that Hoffman's killing an href tag containing an image would have effectively kept such content from being rendered either to a screen, a printer or other display or output device, providing the benefit of saving resources.

In regard to dependent Claim 9 (and similarly dependent Claims 24, and 38), neither FinePrint nor FinePrint Web teach *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: deleting an element*. However, Hoffman teaches a filter method must process the hreftag to kill any image tags contained within it. By examining the href itself, the system can often discern whether images contained within it are ads (advertising). Specifically, the system can discern a hypertext jump destination, which is invoked from a particular image. If the destination is an ad site

Art Unit: 2176

(e.g., such as the adsl destination shown above), the system can block the image(s) associated with the hreftag for the hypertext reference to that site. The actual subroutine call to lookup the image as one referencing an ad site occurs at line (370). In the event that the image is identified as an ad, the method sets the KillNextIMG flag to "true" at line (377) and increments the "number (of ads) killed" counter at line (380). Since the kill next image flag has been set, the next iteration through the loop will kill any image, which it follows within this hreftag (Col. 29, lines 42-58). Though Hoffman does not explicitly teach deleting an element, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to understand that Hoffman's killing an href tag containing an image would have effectively kept such content from being rendered either to a screen, a printer or other display or output device, providing the benefit of saving resources.

In regard to dependent Claim 10 (and similarly dependent Claims 25, and 39), neither FinePrint nor FinePrint Web teach *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: deleting all elements of a specified type.*

However, Hoffman teaches a filter method must process the hreftag to kill any image tags contained within it. By examining the href itself, the system can often discern whether images contained within it are ads (advertising). Specifically, the system can discern a hypertext jump destination, which is invoked from a particular image. If the destination is an ad site (e.g., such as the adsl destination shown above), the system can block the image(s) associated with the hreftag for the hypertext reference to that site. The actual subroutine call to lookup the image as one referencing an ad site occurs

Art Unit: 2176

at line (370). In the event that the image is identified as an ad, the method sets the KillNextIMG flag to "true" at line (377) and increments the "number (of ads) killed" counter at line (380). Since the kill next image flag has been set, the next iteration through the loop will kill any image, which it follows within this hreftag (Col. 29, lines 42-58). Though Hoffman does not explicitly teach deleting all elements, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to understand that Hoffman's killing an href tag containing an image (<img tag directed to an advertisement) would have effectively kept such content from being rendered either to a screen, a printer or other display or output device, providing the benefit of saving resources.

In regard to dependent Claim 11 (and similarly dependent Claims 26, and 40), neither FinePrint nor FinePrint Web teach *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: deleting an element associated with a graphical object*. However, Hoffman teaches a filter method must process the hreftag to kill any image tags contained within it. By examining the href itself, the system can often discern whether images contained within it are ads (advertising). Specifically, the system can discern a hypertext jump destination, which is invoked from a particular image. If the destination is an ad site (e.g., such as the adsl destination shown above), the system can block the image(s) associated with the hreftag for the hypertext reference to that site. The actual subroutine call to lookup the image as one referencing an ad site occurs at line (370). In the event that the image is identified as an ad, the method sets the KillNextIMG flag to "true" at line (377) and increments the "number (of ads) killed"

Art Unit: 2176

counter at line (380). Since the kill next image flag has been set, the next iteration through the loop will kill any image, which it follows within this hreftag (Col. 29, lines 42-58). Though Hoffman does not explicitly teach deleting an element, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to understand that Hoffman's killing an href tag containing an image (<img tag directed to an advertisement) would have effectively kept such content from being rendered either to a screen, a printer or other display or output device, providing the benefit of saving resources.

In regard to dependent Claim 12 (and similarly dependent Claims 27, and 41), neither FinePrint nor FinePrint Web teach *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: deleting an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum size*. However, Hoffman teaches that if the Filter is configured to kill ads or kill images larger than a preselected image size (tested at line 506), the method proceeds as follows. The method establishes a network connection. At this point, the server is queried for determining the image size. If the image size exceeds a maximum image size desired by the user, the image will be killed (Col. 30, lines 23-28). Though Hoffman does not explicitly teach deleting an element, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to understand that Hoffman's killing an href tag containing an image (<img tag directed to an advertisement) would have effectively kept such content from being rendered either to a screen, a printer or other display or output device, providing the benefit of saving resources.

In regard to dependent Claim 15 (and similarly dependent Claims 30, and 44), neither FinePrint nor FinePrint Web explicitly teach *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: transcoding an element such that the element will not be rendered during a rendering process while printing the modified copy of the structured document*. However, Hoffman teaches that certain tag types require more complex processing. Consider, for instance, a href or "hyper reference" tag type, which is employed for establishing a hyperlink. An instruction to kill an href tag is, instead, an instruction to kill the image contained within the href tag. Accordingly, the corresponding handler must include logic not for killing the href tag but, instead, for setting a status flag indicating that the system should cycle through (in the dispatcher loop) the tag and kill the image tag contained within the href tag (this changes or transcodes the href tag by eliminating the image tag (attribute)) (Col. 8, lines 54-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of FinePrint, FinePrint Web, and Hoffman because all three deal with modifying an original web document in order to save resources. The benefit of Hoffman's teaching is that it prevents an image from rendering without removing perhaps a hyperlink to the image.

Claims 13, 28, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FinePrint in view of FinePrint Web and in further view of Bickmore et al. (hereinafter Bickmore, "Digestor: Device-independent Access to the World Wide Web", 03/24/00, downloaded from <http://decweb.ethz.ch/WWW6/Technical/Paper177/Paper177.html>).

In regard to dependent Claim 13 (and similarly dependent Claims 28, and 43), neither FinePrint nor FinePrint Web teach *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: deleting text within an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum amount of text*. However, Bickmore teaches techniques for reducing the amount of text displayed on a pervasive (PDA, cell phone, pager) device from a web page intended for a normal browser. It has an automated scenario that provides the user with a forms-based control of the re-authoring process (Sec. 5, 3rd paragraph). It also uses a technique referred to as FirstSentenceElision, which replaces each block of text with its first sentence (or phrase up to some natural break point), and also makes this sentence into a hypertext link to the original text block (Sec. 4.1.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of FinePrint, FinePrint Web, and Bickmore because all employ techniques to reduce the amount of resources needed to display a web page. Bickmore adds a feature to reduce the amount of text displayed, and perhaps printed to enable one to conserve resources.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
11/10/04


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER